

not be transferred to China. That is a pretty reasonable proposition.

The State Department strongly opposes the European Union's lifting of the arms embargo. Secretary of State Colin Powell said the following on March 1:

Regarding arms sales to China, I expressed concern that the European Union might lift its arms embargo. We and the European Union imposed prohibitions for the same reasons, most especially China's serious human rights abuses, and we believe that those reasons remain valid today.

It is this government's policy that the arms embargo remain in effect. We are talking about military arms now, not trade. We have a huge amount of trade with China. We are not talking about that. We are talking about limiting certain kinds of militarily useful equipment.

At a February hearing of the U.S.-China Economic Security Review Commission, the Deputy Assistant Secretary in the State Department for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Randy Shriver, also expressed U.S. opposition to the European Union's lifting of the embargo for three key reasons: the human rights reason, China's lax export control policies, and China's military buildup against Taiwan. Similar concerns have been put forth by Department of Defense officials.

While we don't like to talk about it, there has been a change in the direction of the buildup of the Chinese military. They have changed their doctrine to a doctrine which explicitly is designed to be able to defeat U.S. military assets. They are proliferating dangerous weapons and technologies to some of our potential adversaries—North Korea, as one example.

The intelligence community produces a semiannual report on proliferation. The most recent report stated the following with respect to China:

We cannot rule out . . . some continued contacts [related to assistance to unsafeguarded nuclear facilities] subsequent to the pledge between Chinese entities and entities associated with Pakistan's nuclear weapons program.

. . . Chinese entities continued to work with Pakistan and Iran on ballistic missile-related projects during the first half of 2003 . . . Chinese-entity ballistic missile assistance helped Iran move toward its goal of becoming self-sufficient in the production of ballistic missiles. In addition, firms in China provided dual-use missile-related items, raw materials, and/or assistance to several other countries of proliferation concern—such as Iran, Libya, and North Korea.

During the first half of 2003, China remained a primary supplier of advanced and conventional weapons to both Pakistan and Iran. Islamabad also continued to negotiate with Beijing for China to build up to four frigates for Pakistan's navy and develop FC-1 fighter aircraft.

China also continues to threaten democratic Taiwan and to prepare militarily for a conflict against not only Taiwan, but also against the United States, were U.S. military forces to come to the assistance of Taiwan directly.

According to one recent Washington Post article, the Chinese Government

warned Taiwan's President Chen Shui-bian to pull back what he called "a dangerous lurch toward independence or face destruction."

The Defense Department's annual report to Congress on the military power of the People's Republic of China warned

. . . the focus of China's short and medium term conventional modernization efforts has been to prepare for military contingencies in the Taiwan Strait, to include scenarios involving U.S. intervention.

According to a previous report, the U.S.-China Security Review Commission, now the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, China's military was directed to have viable options to retake Taiwan by 2005 to 2007. Let me repeat: China's military was told to be prepared for conflict with Taiwan by next year.

The DOD report further comments on the impact of the EU lifting its arms embargo stating:

Efforts under way to lift the European Union embargo on China will provide additional opportunities to acquire specific technologies from Western suppliers.

That is precisely the problem I think we have to come to grips with at some point. I am extraordinarily supportive of efforts to show political support for and, in fact, enhanced military cooperation with our allies, as the Warner amendment certainly does. But I also think we have to look at the export control policies which might, were the European Union to lift the arms embargo, allow material weapons implications to reach a country such as China. We obviously cooperate with China on matters of trade, for example. And it plays an important role in the international community. But it is a country with 20 nuclear-tipped missiles capable of reaching the United States, and the Pentagon projects that number will reach 30 by next year.

It is a country that has an announced policy that would be very dangerous if implemented with respect to Taiwan. So if the EU lifts its arms embargo, European countries will have the capacity to willingly pass military technology, and U.S. military technology, if we don't have the proper transfer or retransfer protections in place to a country that presents a potential military threat to the United States.

My amendment would have prevented that from happening by simply saying that no U.S. military equipment could be provided to countries in the European Union unless there is a Presidential certification that there are binding assurances from such country that those goods won't be transferred to China.

I don't think that is too much to ask. I think at some point we are going to have to include that within our law. The chairman of the committee has been very gracious in talking to me about working toward that end. As I said, I think in view of the great importance of moving this bill forward, completing action on it so we can pro-

vide the authority for the Defense Department and the other forces necessary for the next year, I am not going to offer my amendment. I certainly hope at an appropriate time we will be able to include the concept of what I am talking about in this Defense authorization bill.

I compliment the chairman for the work he has done, and I express my hope we can conclude this bill soon. We have been on it now for almost a month, or half a month with respect to legislative days. I think it is time to come to an agreement on how to end debate and get it done. After all, we are in a war. We have to protect the American people and provide for the men and women we have put into harm's way for that purpose.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank our distinguished colleague from Arizona. He has been part of the team that has worked almost every day for agreements on the floor, and in consultation on how to deal with the various challenges we have had. He has been one of many who has made it possible. I think we are making steady progress here. I thank the Senator for the reference to the ITAR amendment, which I put in. I consulted with him, Senator BIDEN, and a great many Senators who worked with me in making this amendment possible, which is currently a part of the managers' package and, I anticipate, will become part of the final bill. It is long overdue, as the Senator points out. But this amendment is sort of a keystone. I thank the Senator for adding that very important piece of legislative history to what I hope will be a statutory provision that reflects the goals we both had in mind.

At this time, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I don't know the situation regarding this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

Mr. WARNER. The bill is still actively being considered. There is a possibility we can achieve completion of the bill tonight. I remain of that view.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, we are in morning business.

#### DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have come to the floor because I am worried about the Defense appropriations bill. This bill that has been prepared by primarily Sid Ashworth and Charlie Houy of our Defense Subcommittee, under the direction of my cochairman Dan Inouye and myself, was considered by the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and reported to the full committee in 17 minutes. We took it to the full committee and we had a debate on that bill. It was reported to the floor in 25 minutes.

The reason for that is, as we all know, there is in this bill an amount of

\$25 billion requested by the President for a reserve for Iraq and Afghanistan and the war on terror. We know if there is a development in Iraq, in particular, which will give rise to a need for money, this bill must become law before we leave for the conventions in August, or really late July, before the August recess.

Some of us in this body have served overseas, particularly in wartime. It was my privilege to do that in World War II. I was thinking just now about what is going on here on the floor, and how I used to feel as a young man when we were told our supplies had not come over the hump into China, that we were going to have to reduce our rations, maybe live a little more on local food than on the food we brought into China from a long distance from our country. I thought about the time Colin Powell, as a young assistant to the then-head of the National Security Council, came before a Senate subcommittee on appropriations, and he told us at the time, when he was a young captain in Cambodia, he had the duty to take out a whole Vietnamese battalion, and the U.S. troops along with him had to go into Cambodia on a drop mission. They parachuted in. They were given a 2-week supply of food. He told us when you get up on that 14th day and open up the last bit of your rations, that is when you start thinking about the people who are in Washington that you trust. That is when you start thinking about whether the people who run the Government know what they are doing when they send you into foreign countries, like Cambodia, in wartime.

As I speak now, there are men and women in the armed services in our U.S. uniform in 120 countries. Managing the Department of Defense is an overwhelming job right now. The money we are spending is enormous, but the cause we are on is just. Whether you feel it is just or not, the problem is, we now know that when we leave for the conventions, there is a great possibility the Department of Defense and Commander in Chief will have to have more money available than is currently available in fiscal year 2004. Our committee, the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and the Appropriations Committee, has worked long hours to bring this bill before the Senate so we can pass it before we leave on this recess for the Fourth of July, and be able to come back and be ready to conference it, because staff conferences during the recess, and bring it back to the floor so both the House and the Senate can pass the bill and get it to the President and have it become law before we leave before the end of July.

I hear a lot of comments from people about the problem of the debt ceiling. I have checked and, in all probability, we will reach the debt ceiling in August. There is a debate on how to handle that. The House has decided to put it in the Appropriations bill, and I have

been asked, as manager of the bill, to commit that I will not bring this bill back from conference with a debt ceiling in it. I can make no such commitment. Neither the Senator from Hawaii nor I can make that commitment. We are committed to doing our job as Senators, carrying out our oath to support and defend the Constitution and the people who support the Constitution.

I, for one, am getting a little impatient about getting this bill done. The current bill, I was told, would be done last night, and we would be on our bill now. We are not on the Defense bill now. We should be on the Defense appropriations bill now.

I hope and pray every Senator in this body will search his soul about delaying this bill, because I mean what I say: there is no possibility of getting this bill to the President, in my judgment, in a matter of 10 days after we get back unless we pass it now, and the President has time to go through the bill to determine if he is going to sign it.

I implore the Senate to finish this bill. Either the Senator from Hawaii or I have been chairman of the Defense Subcommittee since 1981. We have never found a situation where we would even consider cloture on the Defense appropriations bill.

I cannot imagine a Member of this Senate voting against cloture on an appropriations bill for defense when there is a war going on.

I say to the Senate, it is time to come to our senses and get this authorization bill done tonight so we can get on the appropriations bill tonight and finish it tomorrow or, at the latest, Friday morning. If we can get this bill through the subcommittee in 17 minutes and 25 minutes in the full committee, this Senate can get through this bill in 36 hours.

I guarantee, if there is any thought of delay, we will stay in session 36 hours because I am going to see to it this bill is passed and goes to the President this week. Some people say it is not going to happen, but if I have to embarrass every Member of the Senate to get it done, I am going to do it. This bill must be passed. We are at war. We are at war.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum all be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CHILD NUTRITION AND WIC REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2004

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 580, S. 2507.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2507) to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to provide children with increased access to food and nutrition assistance, to simplify program operations and improve program management, to reauthorize child nutrition programs, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to present to the Senate S. 2507, legislation to reauthorize the child nutrition programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the next 5 years. Over the past year and a half, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry has held hearings and received suggestions from a wide range of interests for improvements in the programs that are authorized in this bill. The committee worked diligently to draft a consensus bill that will ensure the continuation of proven Federal Government support for meeting the nutritional needs of school children and others who will benefit from these programs. I would like to thank especially the distinguished ranking member of the committee, the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN, for his assistance and for continuing the longstanding tradition of a bipartisan approach to the development of child nutrition bills in our committee.

The committee met on May 19, 2004, and reported the bill unanimously. This bill reflects the commitment of the committee to ensure that our Nation's children have access to the nutrition they need to lead a healthy life. All of the worthwhile and important initiatives contained in this bill will play a significant part in ensuring that our children have access to good nutrition.

The programs authorized in this bill touch the lives of one out of every five people in this country, including over 37 million children and nearly 2 million lower income pregnant and postpartum women. According to the Congressional Research Service, total fiscal year 2004 spending for these programs will be an estimated \$16.4 billion, and the administration's fiscal year 2005 budget anticipates spending \$16.85 billion. The Budget Committees of both the Senate and House have seen fit to include new mandatory money that will enable us to continue otherwise expiring provisions contained in current law. Even though we had no money for new initiatives, we believe the committee has put together an overall package that improves these programs while protecting the interests of the participants.

Important components of the bill are: Protection of the integrity of school meal program benefits, participation of for-profit child care centers in the Child and Adult Care Food Program,